

Can the Internet Increase Political Participation? An Analysis of Remote Electronic Voting's Effect on Turnout

Daniel Bochsler



CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF IMPERFECTIONS IN DEMOCRACY
A research center at Central European University

NÁDOR U. 9, 1051, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY, DISC@CEU.HU, WWW.DISC-CEU.ORG

Can the Internet increase political participation?

An analysis of remote electronic voting's effect on turnout

Daniel Bochsler¹

Abstract

There are far-reaching expectations that electronic democracy will increase political participation, and include previously underrepresented groups in politics. So far, however, there is little empirical evidence to monitor such trends. In 2007, Estonia became the first country to organise national parliamentary elections in which all voters had a choice of casting their vote at traditional polls, or over the Internet. This study analyses individual data from a special survey of 1000 respondents, as well as aggregated election results from the 234 Estonian municipalities. Instead of attracting new voters, it seems, Internet voting mostly substituted for existing votes at the polls. Furthermore, instead of attracting social groups that usually abstain from elections, Internet voting has for the most part attracted the same politically well-established groups. Finally, it seems that the effects of this new voting technology are not politically neutral: Internet voters favoured political parties that receive strong support from the ethnic majority and from wealthy areas. If it is to have any effect on political participation, Internet voting seems poised to *increase* inequalities, rather than level them.

Keywords: Internet and democracy; political participation; turnout; Estonia; aggregate data analysis.

¹ Centre for Comparative and International Studies, ETH/University of Zurich, Centre for the Study of Imperfections in Democracies, Central European University

Can the Internet increase political participation?

An analysis of remote electronic voting's effect on turnout

Daniel Bochsler

Introduction*

Can technology save democracy? Based on decreasing turnout in elections and referenda in the 1990s (Dalton, 2006: 36-37; Gray & Caul, 2000), scholars and politicians all too often lament people's loss of interest in democratic procedures and their growing alienation from society and democracy.² Both scholars and politicians hope that new forms of democratic participation will simplify access to democratic institutions, create new forms of participation, and re-animate democracy. Some have focused on the potential of new communications technologies, particularly the Internet.³

While these discussions remain mostly speculative and theoretical in nature, this study investigates the consequences of the first—and so far, only—case of Internet voting⁴ in national parliamentary elections, the Estonian Rigikogu elections in 2007. In particular, my analysis aims to determine whether this new form of voting could increase turnout, and if it might lead to better representation and greater political participation.

Expectations for new communications technologies have been mixed. Some critics complain that the technology has contributed to the individualisation and de-integration of post-modern societies, eroding civic and political engagement, and resulting in a protracted decrease in voter turnout (Putnam, 2000). Others see new communications technologies as providing new democratic arenas and new channels for participation (see Stolle & Hooghe, 2005 for an overview of the discussion). By these means, it is thought that e-democracy

* I am in dept to the Estonian Electoral Commission and to Alexander Trechsel and his research team, for putting at my disposal the data on which this study is based, and to Simon Hug, Pascal Sciarini, and Allan Sikk, who raised some very relevant points to me during the writing of this paper.

The paper has been presented at the APSA 2009 Annual Meeting in Toronto, 3-6 September 2009, and at the 5th ECPR General Conference, 10-12 September 2009, Potsdam.

² In many countries, turnout peaked in the 1950s and 1960s, followed by a general drop in turnout that included large countries such as France, Germany, and the United States.

³ See Trechsel (2007a) for an overview.

⁴ While internet is the most important way of casting a vote electronically from home, the office, or a public internet point, there are other technologies that might also enable remote electronic voting. For the sake of simplicity, I speak generally of internet voting in this study. Remote electronic voting should not be confused with electronic auxiliaries that may be used in physical polling stations for the purpose of casting votes (see Gibson, 2005 for technical aspects on electronic voting).

could help to rectify the legitimacy problem that has crept up on democracies in times of increasingly weak participation.⁵

However, the questions must be asked: do new forms of participation lead to new, increased participation, or do they simply substitute conventional democratic processes? Do they allow social groups that have previously been marginalised to be more closely involved?⁶

As noted above, remote voting over the Internet (along with other novel communications technologies) has mostly been subject to theoretical discussions, rather than empirical investigation. It has only been analyzed in experiments involving a very limited number of voters, for primaries or university elections, or and for local second-order elections.⁷ In 2007, Estonia became the first country to allow remote electronic voting in a national parliament election, giving us the opportunity to do the first analysis of Internet voting on turnout in a national parliamentary election. Estonia perceives new communication technology very positively; the IT sector is strong there, and Estonians are well-acquainted with computers and the Internet. Estonia had already allowed Internet voting in municipal elections two years before the 2007 national elections. Large parts of the population have Internet access at home, at work, or in public Internet stations, and in 2005, 76-percent of Estonian taxpayers declared their income tax via the Internet (Trechsel, 2007b: 9).

As a case study, Estonia is well suited for our study of Internet voting's effects on turnout, since the social selectivity of turnout in Estonia is not very different from the European average. Income, education, age, and ethnic affiliation have all been shown to be relevant determinants of a person's probability to turn out at the polls (Gallego, 2007). Furthermore, previous research has scrutinized the social composition of Internet voters in the Estonian 2007 elections, by means of a special survey (Trechsel, 2007b). From this research, it can be said that Internet voting has mostly addressed established social groups – people who have attained a certain level of education, and who are fluent Estonian speakers. However, such survey-driven research yields limited insight into the question of whether the Internet vote has generated genuinely *new* turnout—or if it has merely attracted voters who would otherwise have cast their vote at the polls. This issue is particularly pressing, since reasonably high and socially equal turnout is typically upheld as fundamentals of

⁵ For instance, Trechsel and Mendez (2005) discuss the introduction of e-voting as a strategy that the European Union might consider, as a reaction to low turnout in European Parliamentary elections.

⁶ Liff and Shepherd (2004) argue that, despite the closing gap in numbers between male and female internet users, the internet could be shaped over the long term by the interests of early adopters—that is to say, male users—contributing to an enduring gender gap.

⁷ Several countries have experimented with Internet voting in selected locations (see Gibson, 2005: 32-33 for an overview). For primary elections, see Gibson (2002), Solop (2002), or Prevost and Schaffner (2008). For experiments in regular elections, see (Auer & Trechsel, 2001).

democratic elections. Indeed, they are thought to constitute important bedrock qualities of a democratic process.

This paper considers Internet voting's effect on voter turnout and on the social selectivity of the voting process in the 2007 Estonian elections—employing various dynamic methodologies to accomplish its goal. After a review of the relevant pre-existing literature, I will address the burgeoning methodological problems of this area of study, and then analyse the available empirical data in three steps: First, I will undertake an analysis of the aggregated data, to see if the increased turnout in the 2007 Estonian elections can be related to the Internet vote; second, I will analyze individual electoral data to deduce trends in social inclusion brought about by in Internet voting; and third, I will consult the actual electoral results to surmise the political differences between Internet voters and conventional voters.

Pragmatic versus optimistic expectations in e-democracy

The existing literature has vividly discussed the improvements that new communications technology may offer in the way of democratic participation. While pragmatic reasons have been suggested—focusing on the streamlining of the voting process, and the attendant efficiency gains for voters and for the election and referendum administration—these concerns have remained marginal. Indeed, visionary concepts prevail—notions that this new technology might remedy existing problems in representative democracies. Norris (2005: 60) summarises the situation thusly: “If citizens will not come to the polls, [...] why not bring the polls closer to the citizens?”.

The early literature presented a particularly "cyber-optimistic" picture, envisioning the Internet as a means to revolutionise the processes of democratic representation by including new groups of voters, and giving new legitimacy to the institutions of democracy (see more in Trechsel, 2007a; Norris, 2001: 96-97). Furthermore, the digital medium was expected to enable a more comprehensive concept of electronically stimulated democratic control. Cheap and easy communication through the Internet was expected to decrease barriers to civic engagement, and such to diminish inequalities in public life. “ [...] New technology will allow people to be far more knowledgeable about public policy issues, articulate in expressing their opinions, and active in casting their votes” (Norris, 2001: 235).

One rationale for predicting higher turnout was rooted in the idea that – for a part of the electorate – the Internet would simplify the time-consuming process of voting, thereby attracting additional voters. However, an increase in turnout does not necessarily indicate an increase in the turnout of underrepresented social groups. Indeed, this kind of change depends on the exact shape of the function that relates turnout propensities to the vote proportion of social groups (Grofman, Owen, & Collet, 1999: 361). In addition, this neglects that fact that Internet use is a socially selective phenomenon. Indeed, Internet voting can only ease voting for those who are already familiar with the Internet: that is to say,

predominantly male, young people, the rich, and the well educated (Norris, 2001: 68-92). From this, it would seem that Internet voting seems poised to facilitate the voting process for those who are *already* well informed about politics, and who are *already* participating in elections more frequently. Indeed, high education and high income are two of the three factors that correlate most strongly with political participation in North America, Western Europe, and in new EU member states (cf. Dalton, 2006; Gallego, 2007). With this in mind, I am inclined to predict that those voters (and voter groups) who are most likely to use the Internet to vote already participate at a high level in government. This suggests that the convenience of online voting might only increase turnout marginally.

Overall, I believe that the online vote will most likely merely *substitute* for turnout at the polls. (as argued by others, Alvarez & Nagler, 2001; Norris, 2001; Gibson, 2002) the voters groups who are likely to use Internet voting most extensively already correspond highly with the groups who are among the best-represented political interests. So, if Internet voting is to have any effect on turnout, it seems likely that it may further *increase* social disparities in political participation, and reproduce “politics as usual” (Norris, 2001: 236). Such a hypothesis elicits questions about the quality of representation and inclusion. Higher turnout does not automatically mean that an election is more representative. Indeed, elections are only highly representative if voters—regardless of their social group—have the same chance of belonging to the electorate.

The empirical findings of experiments with e-democracy and primary elections provoke little excitement about the possibilities for rising turnout and the inclusion of politically marginalised groups. In the Arizona Democratic primary elections 2000, Internet voting was allowed, along with classical voting at polling stations. In the UK, Internet voting was allowed in local elections in selected municipalities, as an alternative to voting at the polling stations. Studies suggest that on both occasions, Internet voting increased the social selectivity of the voting process, attracting mostly voters with a high formal education (Solop, 2002; Norris, 2005: 84-85; Gibson, 2002).⁸ Young citizens are the only ones who tend to have low participation rates in elections at polling stations, but who are slightly better represented among Internet voters (Norris, 2005: 84-85).

Analysing the Estonian municipal elections 2005, Breuer and Trechsel argue that the social differences caused by e-voting can be traced back to the social selectivity of computer access and Internet use:

⁸ Prevost and Schaffner (2008) find that in the case of the 2004 Michigan Democratic primary, where internet voting was only accessible to voters who had previously applied for an absentee ballot, internet voting was not more socially selective than postal voting. This, however, does not put the other results in question, given that the application for an absentee ballot is an additional time-consuming step, which itself is socially selective.

“we found that e-voting is completely neutral with respect to such crucial variables as gender, income, education and the type of settlement – as soon as we control for our entire set of independent variables [computing knowledge⁹]. These results indicate that e-voting scores quite high on a scale of truly democratic procedures” (Trechsel, 2007b: 57)

And furthermore...

“Had we found looming discrepancies according to gender or income, for instance, one could have easily criticized the new form of voting over the internet as introducing very un-democratic biases into the electoral process. This is clearly not the case” (Breuer & Trechsel, 2006).

To put it a different way: Internet voting is more popular among certain social groups, and Breuer, Trechsel and their co-authors show that this can be explained by the lower rate of usage of Internet use by persons with a lower socioeconomic status.

The discussion of the Internet vote’s social selectivity does not answer the question of whether Internet voting substitutes for votes at the polls, or if it creates genuinely new votes, however. Most studies in this area have employed voter surveys to analyse the social structure of Internet voters (Gibson, 2002; Trechsel, 2007b; Breuer & Trechsel, 2006; Solop, 2002). But one can hardly estimate the substitution effect using surveys alone. Indeed, there might be a bias when estimating the number of new voters, and accordingly, one might analyse the structure of Internet voters without knowing which are genuinely new voters and what voters otherwise would have voted at the polls (Grofman et al., 1999).

Few studies have relied on methods other than surveys to analyse the effect of new forms of voting on turnout. They have studied the outcomes of elections, where new voting procedures were introduced only in certain regions, allowing them to test for effects on turnout through a quasi-experimental cross-sectional design. These studies show that postal voting has a much stronger effect on turnout than remote electronic voting. Since in Switzerland, each of the 26 cantons decides on its own voting procedure, postal voting was introduced at different times. Luechinger, Rosinger, and Stutzer (2007) studied the introduction of postal voting on Swiss turnout, finding that cantons that introduced postal voting saw an increase in turnout of approximately 4.3% (yielding an average turnout of 43%). In his study of the introduction of Internet voting and postal voting in UK local elections in 2003, Norris demonstrates that postal voting had a stronger effect on turnout than remote electronic voting did. In districts with postal voting pilots, turnout increased by

⁹ See pages 47, 51-52 of the report.

some 15%, while there was even a modest decrease in districts with electronic voting pilots (Norris, 2005: 77).

So far, analysts have not employed aggregated data to study the effect of electronic voting on turnout in national elections. In nationwide elections with Internet voting, there is no cross-sectional variance in the voting rules, meaning that panel data are needed to estimate the effects of electronic voting. Variance in the usage of the electronic vote within a country might reveal information about whether e-voting increases the overall turnout. This is the first study that investigates the effects of nationwide e-voting on turnout, using aggregated data.

Data and study design

This study employs both individual and aggregated data to analyse voting behaviour in the 2007 Estonian elections, as compared to previous Estonian national elections.

Individual-level data from surveys is helpful for characterising the electorate of certain parties, or for distinguishing voters from non-voters. But the availability of survey data is often limited to a few elections, and typically does not allow us to trace voters' behaviours over time. Furthermore, surveys have some difficulty tracking counterfactuals—such as the question of whether a change in some explanatory variables may lead to a change in voting behaviour—since surveys are poorly suited for hypothetical questions (Grofman et al., 1999). This in turn makes it hard to estimate the effect of Internet voting on an electorate's behaviour using surveys—and difficult for us to understand people's voting behaviour in the absence of Internet voting. Even individual panel data cannot inform us as to whether a possible change in voting behaviour was induced by changes in the voting procedures, or other factors.¹⁰ A long-term study of turnout at the individual level might allow us to evaluate whether Internet voters are similar to groups of citizens who had previously abstained from participation in elections. But individual election data on Estonia is quite rare. In addition, respondents to the 2007 survey were not asked about their participation in the 2003 parliamentary elections. Because of this, we lack information about the hypothetical behaviour of Internet voters, and cannot speculate as to how they might behave if there were no Internet vote. Due to this general dearth of data, it becomes most difficult to investigate the question of whether Internet voting is socially selective. It is possible that the substitution effect—of paper votes replacing Internet votes— is socially selective, and we can hardly control for this.

Given the absence of individual data that would allow for a full investigation of the core of our hypotheses, we rely on aggregate data taken from 234 Estonian municipalities and city

¹⁰ Furthermore, the introduction of internet voting might have indirect effects on non-electronic voting, too. For instance, internet voting should reduce queues at polling stations; this might attract previous abstainers to vote in polling stations, or it might make social control of the voting process impossible, and thereby decrease turnout.

districts. Only one out of thirty entitled voters exercised the option of voting online. Nevertheless, there was substantial variance in electronic turnout between municipalities and social groups. Still, we cannot directly measure the effect of the Internet voting option on turnout at large.

Aggregated data have often been employed to study electoral behaviour, especially when no accurate individual data has been available (cf. Achen & Shively, 1995; King, 1997; King, Rosen, & Tanner, 2004), and if social groups live in a (partly) territorially segregated fashion. In Estonia, this is the case for ethno-linguistic minorities, who are overwhelming majorities in a few localities, and are not present in others. For the other explanatory variables in play, there are no clear-cut territorial boundaries, and aggregated data analysis could lead to ecological fallacies. In order to minimise such risk, I have complemented my analysis of aggregated data with survey data analyses, for all those aspects that can be studied with the available cross-sectional survey data.

In my analysis, I have chosen to focus on whether remote electronic voting has helped to increase turnout in the Estonian elections in 2007, compared to the previous national elections in 2003. I control for whether the increase might be due to a general trend, independent of e-voting (constant for the whole country), or whether there might be other factors that explain the change in political participation.¹¹ Among the models used to analyze aggregated voting data, the Goodman regression model allows for the inclusion of a constant (measuring the general trend) as well as control variables—even those that do not occur in the form of a percentage of a population, such as tax revenues per capita in the present example (Achen & Shively, 1995).

This method has been criticised (see King, 1997: 56-68; Achen & Shively, 1995) because it can yield unrealistic values, violating basic mathematical parameters. For example, it can lead to unreal estimates, suggesting that certain groups vote at more than 100% or at less than 0% for a certain option. This might occur if effects are falsely assumed to be linear, or if the parameters that I test are not constant across observations—something that is a genuine problem of ecological data analysis. While the Goodman model does not capture heteroskedasticity, I am careful to calculate robust standard errors, controlling for heteroskedasticity. Furthermore, I control for whether some of the variables may violate the natural bounds of 0% or 100%. Finally, other ecological inference models do not provide

¹¹ Those ecological inference models that attempt to elucidate individual voters' behaviour from aggregated data (King, 1997) are not very helpful for our purposes. Attempts to explain individual voters' behaviour in this fashion are best used if *only* aggregated data is available. Methods have now been developed to track correlations between the voting behaviour of individuals and of social groups. Models that are aimed at analysing the behaviour of individual voters or social groups, compared to the previous elections, help to describe how certain voters have changed their voting behaviour (such as voting electronically, after having abstained in previous elections), but this does not allow any conclusions to be drawn about the reasons for their changing behaviour. The same problem applies to Thomsen's (1987) logit regression model, which analyses changes in the voting behaviour in two elections. Tests using the Thomsen model (available on request) lead to contradicting results when the baseline category is changed.

robust results if data varies only over a small portion of its possible range, as in the case of Internet-voting, which is used only by small parts of the registered voters (King, 1997: 73)

Does the e-vote increase turnout? The Estonian 2007 elections

Estonia was the first country in the world to allow its voters to cast their vote over the Internet in countrywide parliamentary elections in 2007 (a process that took place four to six days in advance of the election). Voting was enabled by electronic ID-cards, which are used widely in Estonia, and which allow for a voter to be electronically identified. As an alternative, voters could still vote at the polls on Election Day. The same system had been used two years earlier in the local elections (Breuer & Trechsel, 2006; Madise, Vinkel, & Maater, 2005). The Internet voting procedure has been described as fairly difficult, while the paper ballot at the polls has generally been recognized for its simplicity. (For a technical description of the voting procedure, see Alvarez, Hall, & Trechsel, 2008.)

	mean (weighted)	std dev (weighted)	min	max
<i>Turnout</i>				
Turnout 2003 at polls	57.3%	6.2%	41.9%	94.9%
Turnout 2007 at polls	57.9%	5.0%	42.4%	70.8%
E-vote share 2007	3.4%	1.5%	0.0%	10.1%
Change in turnout at polls, 2003-07	0.6%	0.3%	-24.1%	18.1%
<i>Party votes at the polls</i>				
Green party (EER), 2007	6.9%	2.5%	0.0%	20.0%
Green party (EER) * Turnout 2007	4.0%	1.6%	0.0%	9.8%
Res Publica (RP), 2003	24.7%	6.6%	0.0%	68.2%
Res Publica (RP) * Turnout 2003	14.2%	4.3%	0.0%	42.1%
<i>Socio-economic variables</i>				
Tax revenue per capita (log)	8.642	0.307	7.465	9.720
Eastern Slavic languages, % ^a	24.1%	25.1%	0.3%	95.8%
Linguistic heterogeneity ^b	0.120	0.083	0.003	0.250
Primary sector, % ^c	7.7%	10.0%	0.0%	51.9%
Secondary sector, % ^c	30.9%	8.1%	6.8%	67.1%

Table 1: Descriptive statistics (mean of all 234 municipalities, importance weighted by the number of registered voters).

Sources: Sikk & Bochler (2008) and Estonian Electoral Commission for figures on the e-vote.

Notes: The turnout figures do not include any invalid votes (since they are not available at the municipal level. The political parties' vote share slightly differs from the actual vote share, because only the votes cast at the polls are available at the municipal level (the Green party's actual vote share, including e-votes, was 7.1%).

a. The main linguistic cleavage in Estonia divides speakers of Eastern Slavic languages (Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian) from other inhabitants. Russian speakers dominate the Eastern Slavic community in numbers, and Ukrainians and Belarusians seem to behave similar to them politically (Sikk & Bochler, 2008).

b. The variable linguistic heterogeneity measures the intensity of ethnic conflict in the partisan model. It is calculated as the product of the share of speakers of Eastern Slavic languages and speakers of other languages.

c. The primary sector is defined as agriculture and fishing; the secondary sector is defined as mining, industry and construction.

From 2003 to 2007, voter turnout in Estonia rose by 4%. Even if Internet votes (3.4%) are not counted, a tiny increase in turnout remains evident (see table 1; n.b., figures do not include invalid votes). However, a causal link between the introduction of Internet voting and increased voter turnout is not evident. Voters who went to the polling station were not necessarily the same in both elections. Various time-related circumstances, which are not linked to the voting procedure, may explain the increase in turnout. I argue that, if the boost of the turnout was due to the introduction of e-voting, then the municipalities with a high e-turnout should show a particularly strong increase in turnout. Inversely, municipalities with less prevalence of Internet voting should demonstrate lower rates of turnout increase, after controlling for other explanations of changes in turnout, such as political or socio-economic effects.

In this analysis, I investigate whether *e-turnout* (the vote share cast over the Internet) had a significant effect on the change in turnout at the polls from 2003 to 2007, looking at the 234 Estonian municipalities or city districts. If higher e-turnout did not affect turnout at the polls (after controlling for alternative explanations) this would indicate that Internet votes were genuinely new, and that these Internet votes increased the overall turnout. If higher e-turnout were related to lower turnout at the polls, however, the results would suggest the presence of a substitution effect, with electronic votes replacing conventional voting instead of increasing overall turnout.¹²

¹² Such analysis can make only limited interference about the behaviour of individual voters. An analysis of aggregated data can not measure factors that do not vary or that vary only slightly in the territory (such as gender or age groups). Furthermore, aggregated analyses have difficulty with interactive and non-linear effects

To control for alternative explanations, I have implemented a political and a socio-economic model. *Politically*, turnout is related to electoral competition, and new parties can attract new voters who previously did not have an appropriate choice of who to vote for. Accordingly, when parties disappear, some of their previous voters might stay at home. This is why we should pay attention to *Res Publica*, which competed as new party in 2003, and stressed its newness in the electoral campaign. As a new party, it may have attracted voters who were disappointed by the established parties, causing them to go to the polls in order to vote for *Res Publica*. Three years later, the party had left many of its voters disappointed, having failed to deliver on many of its promises (Taagepera, 2006; Solvak & Pettai, 2008). Subsequently, it transformed from a newcomer party to one of the pillars of the government, and it merged with an established Estonian party, the Pro Patria Union (Isamaaliit). Because of this, anti-establishment voters, who might have supported the newcomer in 2003 instead of abstaining, may have turned away by 2007.

The 2007 elections produced a different newcomer—the *Estonian Greens* (Erakond Eestimaa Rohelised). Despite roots going back to the late 1980s, the Greens only registered as an official political party in November 2006; they ran with their own list for the first time in March 2007 (Sikk & Holmgaard Andersen, 2009). Therefore, even if they may not be a new political organisation, technically speaking, they certainly were perceived as a new electoral competitor.¹³ My *socio-economic model* controls for the typical parameters of social cleavages, which are commonly used in studies of electoral behaviour, and which can explain territorial differences in voting behaviour in Estonia.

First, I estimated a voter stream model, to show how groups of voters changed their electoral behaviour between 2003 and 2007, using a Goodman regression model and aggregated results from the 234 municipalities, and also including two sets of control variables. Without any control variables, we would need to assume that the voter streams are constant in all 234 municipalities, which means that the rate for each of the five relationships (polls → polls/Internet/abstainers; abstainers → polls/Internet/abstainers), is constant over the 234 municipalities. Figure 1 shows a summary of the results of the analysis (for detailed results, see appendix). The model first shows that (non-)participation was highly stable. Out of six voters who went to the polls in the 2003 elections, almost five did

when they are not controlled for. However, this problem can certainly occur in research with individual data as well.

¹³ I have measured the vote share of *Res Publica* and the vote share of the Green Party as percentages of the overall number of registered voters. These variables possess the advantage of having the same denominator as the dependent variable—turnout—and they allow for a direct estimation of the impact of the *Res Publica* and the Green Party vote on turnout. However, one must be careful in implementing these variable; if the Green vote share and *Res Publica* vote were related to turnout (or, would be constant), then the variables employed (*Green Party vote* * *turnout07*; *RP vote* * *turnout03*) would be linear transformations of turnout in 2003 and of turnout in 2007, and accordingly, would almost perfectly estimate the dependent variable. This is why I have also calculated the model with a conventional operationalisation, using the number of valid votes as the denominator. The alternative operationalisation leads to almost identical results—a fact that reassures me that the preferred solution is no transformation of turnout.

so again four years later, and additional 8% voted online. 80% of the abstainers in 2003 decided not vote either in the 2007 elections. Hence, more previous abstainers decided to go to the polls in 2007 than vice-versa. After controlling for partisan and socio-economic factors, the models suggest that there were hardly any Internet voters who abstained in the previous elections (the models report a value slightly lower than 0%).




Figure 1: Voter stream between 2003 and 2007, vote at polling station, on the Internet and abstainers. The voter streams are calculated relatively to the 2003 figure.

Calculation based on seemingly unrelated regression models, with partisan control variables. (For the figure, partisan control variables are set at their mean.)

Effect on turnout, model with political party control

While these voter stream models investigate specific *patterns*, of how certain groups of voters changed their behaviour from one election to the other, in the second model I will attempt to estimate the overall effect of e-voting on turnout. To do this, I will investigate whether turnout rose more in municipalities that more frequently employed the Internet vote, than in municipalities demonstrating relatively less incidence of Internet voting. I assume that turnout at the polls in 2007 was closely related to turnout in 2003, and that differences in turnout can be explained by either the introduction of the Internet vote (substitution effect), by a general effect (which is constant across the whole country), or by other, exogenous factors, such as socio-economically or politically caused changes in turnout. The assumption that 2007's turnout is closely related to 2003's is realistic; both correlate with a Pearson coefficient of 0.87 (municipalities weighted by the number of their inhabitants). I will estimate the results of the following model, in order to explain my dependent variable $diff_{polls03_07}$.

$$\text{diff}_{\text{polls03_07}} = \text{turnout}_{\text{polls07}} - \text{turnout}_{\text{polls03}}$$

$$\text{diff}_{\text{polls03_07}} = \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot \text{e-turnout07} + \beta_x \cdot \text{control variables} + \varepsilon$$

	Political model (1)		Socio-economic model (2)	
	β -Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	β - Coef.	Robust Std. Err.
α	0.015	0.010	-0.465	0.140
e-turnout07	-0.799**	0.263	-0.986**	0.360
voteRP03 * turnout03	-0.118(*)	0.061		
voteEER07 * turnout07	0.841**	0.212		
tax06lg			0.055**	0.017
slavic%	0.002	0.020	-0.021	0.019
ethnic heterogeneity				
primary sector			0.069(*)	0.036
secondary sector			0.087*	0.041
N	234		234	
R ²	0.150		0.200	

Table 2: The party model (model 1) and the socio-economic model (model 2) to explain the differences in turnout at the polls, 2003-2007.

Non-standardised regression coefficients and standard errors. OLS regression with robust standard errors; cases weighted by the total number of registered voters in 2007.

The estimations (table 2) suggest that e-voting was linked to a strong substitution effect: in municipalities where Internet voting was used at a higher rate, turnout at the polls increased much less than in municipalities where only few voted online. The political model (1) estimates that for every 100 Internet votes cast online in a municipality, 80 less voters were frequenting the polls, meaning that very few Internet votes seem to be genuinely new. Turnout seems to have increased for two reasons. First, there was a general increase in turnout (approximately 1.5%, which is constant in the model) linked to the Internet voting; we can infer this because it does not vary to the extent that Internet voting was used in different municipalities. Second, the emergence of the Green party coincides with a substantial increase in turnout in Green strongholds. For every 100 votes cast for the Green

party in a municipality, the turnout at the polls increased by approximately 84 votes, which could signify that the Green party was reviving electoral competition. On the other hand, the merger of Res Publica seems to have had only a small effect on turnout. For every 100 votes that it received in a municipality in 2003, only 12 voters abstained in 2003. Either, Res Publica did not attract many new voters in 2003, or these new voters could not be convinced to remain politically active on a long-term basis. (This data does not imply that the new voters were identical to the voters for the new party, or that Res Publica's 2003 voters and the 2007 abstainers are identical.)

The success of the Green party was most pronounced in areas with affluent populations – areas where turnout has generally increased more than elsewhere – and the party gained few votes in areas with strong concentrations of Eastern Slavic minorities (Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians), and in ethnically heterogeneous areas.¹⁴ Internet voting also saw its greatest use in affluent municipalities, and less use in agricultural and industrial areas, as the second model shows.

In the second model, I test for whether socio-economic variables might explain the boost in turnout in 2007.¹⁵ The results show an even clearer picture than the partisan model: the model suggests that the Internet turnout almost completely substituted previous turnout at the polls. For every additional 100 votes cast on the Internet, the votes at the polls declined by some 99 votes. The increase in turnout, however, seems to be driven by more affluent areas and, to a lesser extent, by areas with a weak tertiary sector. The change in turnout correlates positively with the average personal income tax revenue per capita (data from 2006, logarithmised), with the share of employees in the agricultural sector (numbers incl. fishing), and with the share of employees in the industrial sector (incl. mining, construction). (nb: The constant can not be interpreted directly, because the variable measuring taxes is not bound between 0 and 1.) While there was a lower degree of use of the Internet voting in areas with strong concentrations of Slavic speakers (see below), language did not affect change in turnout at the polls between 2003 and 2007. Slavic speakers vote less frequently than Estonian speakers, but no statistically significant increase in the gap is apparent.

In sum: once the emergence of the Green party or the social structure of the municipalities is controlled for, Internet voting can not explain the increase in turnout.

¹⁴ In the case of the Baltic states, the environmental movements of the 1980s promoted the interests of partisans of ethnic nationalism and independence from the Soviet Union— or, as many ethnic Estonians perceive it, promoted independence from the Russian influence sphere. It is to be expected that the EER, given its legacy, will continue to find major support among (pro-independence) Estonian-speakers than among speakers of Slavonic languages. The EER was the most important newcomer party in the 2007 elections, winning 7.1% of the votes and 6 out of 101 available seats.

¹⁵ Sikk & Bochsler (2008), Sikk & Holmgaard Andersen (2009).

Models with individual data

While the previous models provided insight into the overall, aggregated effect of e-voting on turnout—and are best-suited for investigating counterfactual questions about plausible turnout levels in the absence of e-voting—individual voter behaviour can only be investigated with survey data. Individual data analyses on electoral turnout in Estonia remain rare so far.¹⁶

The decision of whether to vote at the polls, online, or to abstain from voting is a decision with three unordered possible outcomes—a situation that can best be analysed with a multi-nominal logistic regression model. I have weighted the single cases in the sample in order to get a distribution of voters across the three outcome groups that conforms to reality.

While most electoral surveys ask only indirect questions about the costs of voting, respondents to the survey at hand were asked about the distance they travelled to their polling station (figure 2). The vast majority of polling station voters were able to reach their polling station in half an hour or less. Among Internet voters, however, there were many fewer voters who lived very close to a polling station. The overwhelming proportion of the Internet voters cast their vote in 10 minutes or less, and only a few thought they could have voted at the polls as quickly (figure 3).




Figure 2: Estimated distance to polling station in minutes; polling-station voters, Internet voters, and abstainers. (N=974; 13 missing cases excluded.)

Original question: "How long did or do you think it would have taken you to go from your home to your polling place, cast your vote and get back?"

¹⁶ One of the few exceptions, Gallego (2007), is discussed in the introduction.




Figure 3: Comparison of the estimated time to cast the vote at the polling station or to vote online, only Internet voters. (N=362; N=364; 3 respectively 5 missing cases excluded.)

Original question 1: "How long did or do you think it would have taken you to go from your home to your polling place, cast your vote and get back?"

Original question 2: "How long did it take you to vote over the Internet?"¹⁷

For the multivariate analysis, I used the logarithm of the distance, since the effect of a marginal change might decrease for long distances. The results bore this out, showing that turnout and voting method depended heavily on this variable. Voters who lived close to their polling station were likely to vote at the polls, and hardly any of these voters chose to use Internet voting. As distance from the polls increased, however, voters more frequently abstained from voting or used the Internet (figure 4). The 360 sampled voters who voted over the Internet and answered both questions indicated that they saved an average of 25 minutes;¹⁸ furthermore, 81% indicated that it would have taken them at least twice as long to go to the polls as to vote over the Internet. No single Internet voter indicated that electronic voting was more time-consuming than going to the polls.

¹⁷ This variable can not be included in any analytical model of voting behaviour, because a large part of non-internet voters could not answer it. Its inclusion would exclude many respondents, and probably also lead to a selection bias.

¹⁸ After dropping one outlier that would have travelled 60 hours to the polls.




Figure 4: Distance from the polling station (log) and estimated probability of voting, abstaining, or voting through the Internet (all other variables at their mean).

Here, an explanatory model for voting behaviour can best be estimated using a *multinomial logit* model. There are three possible choices for voters: not turning out, going to the polls, or casting their vote online. I weight each case, to help control for possible biases that could result from over-sampling of the Internet voters. This allows me to estimate the probability of each of the three outcomes.¹⁹

¹⁹ Other researchers have focused solely on the voters—analysing their decisions to cast their vote at the polls or online (Trechsel, 2007b; Breuer & Trechsel, 2006). By contrast, I consider the abstainers, too. The possibility of casting one's vote online might make a difference for citizens when they decide whether they should vote or not.

Methodological differences lead to a drop in the R^2 of my model, compared to others. Being interested in the sociologic and political inclusion effect of internet voting, I do not include any variables related to voters' use of computers, or voters' trust in the electronic voting procedure. Such control variables might absorb possible sociological or political effects. I am interested in finding out how the digital divide affects the political behaviour of different social groups, rather than looking at whether computer abilities make it more likely for voters to vote online. Due to the weighting of the cases, R^2 drops from 14.7% to 9.4%, and to 7.3% with the application of a multi-nominal logit model.

Dependent variable (voting behaviour)	abstainers	voters at polling station	Internet voters
weighted distribution	243 (25.0%)	364 (37.4%)	366 (37.6%)
distribution after weighting	38.8%	57.8%	3.4%

Explanatory variables	coding scheme	mean (weighted)	std dev (weighted)	min	max
language	1 = Estonian, 2 = Russian ^a	1.180	0.385	1	2
education degree	1 = elementary/basic; 2 = secondary ed./gymnasium; 3=vocational secondary ed.; 4=higher	2.726	0.976	1	4
age	years	47.383	17.969	18	92
income	monthly, 1 = ≤ 1500 EEK; 2 = 1501-3000 EEK; 3 = 3001-5000 EEK; 4 = 5001-7000 EEK; 5=7001-10000 EEK; 6 = > 10000 EEK (16 EEK ≈ 1 Euro)	3.392	1.185	1	6
gender	1 = male; 2 = female	1.590	0.492	1	2
away (ln)	distance in minutes from polling station (ln)	3.102	0.764	0.693	8.189

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of variables employed in the multi-nominal logit model, N=978. (Importance weighted in order to establish the real distribution of the dependent variable.)

^a There was no question directly identifying respondents' native language or ethnicity; however, interviews were conducted in either Estonian or Russian. Estonian speakers and Russian speakers are the two largest linguistic groups in Estonia, counting some 97% among Estonian citizens in 2000 (source: Estonian Statistical Office). It is not possible, however, to identify members of other ethnic groups.

Figure 5 displays the main results of the multinomial logit analysis graphically. It shows voters' likelihoods for voting at the polls, online, or to abstain, based on their level of education and for the two main languages used in Estonia. Estonian-speakers (red lines) are much more likely to vote than Russian-speakers (blue, dotted lines), both at the polls or online, even after controlling for several other factors, such as education, income, age, and gender. Among Russian-speakers, the chances of voting on the Internet are between 0% and

0.5%. Both Estonian- and Russian-speakers who have higher formal education levels demonstrate a considerably higher propensity to vote; among highly educated citizens, the differences in voting between both language groups are smaller than among Russian-speakers with less formal education. The share of Estonian-speakers with a higher educational degree who votes online is about 6%, compared to 2% for those who hold only an elementary school diploma (after controlling for other variables). This figure shows that Internet voting does not complement turnout at the polling station through addressing politically underrepresented groups of voters. Indeed, it seems that Internet voting instead attracts groups of voters who frequently already go to the polls.

The differences in turnout between the language groups might be related to the specific nature of Internet voting in Estonia in the 2007 national election. Casting a vote electronically required a few more steps than voting at the polls, and explanations were available only in Estonian (they were not provided in Russian or in any of the other Slavic languages frequently spoken in Estonia). It is worth noting, however, that in order to get Estonian citizenship and participate in elections, most Slavic speakers in Estonia must prove their fluency in Estonian as part of a test, and so a large percentage of them would likely be able to follow the explanations for Internet voting²⁰




Figure 5: Voting behaviour by linguistic group and by degree of education (1 = minimum, 4 = maximum).

Based on two separate multinomial logit models for Estonian speakers and for Russian speakers (table 4).

²⁰ The same problem arose in the local elections two years earlier (Breuer & Trechsel, 2006).

A figure with confidence intervals is included in the appendix.

Internet voting proved unable to include groups who have been less politically active in the voting process (table 4). Indeed, it would seem that the Internet vote attracted citizens belonging to social groups that were already more likely to vote than others. Most factors that explain the Internet voting of individual voters are also negatively related to abstaining, (compared to the reference category, voting at the polling station). In general, Internet voting is popular among better educated people with higher incomes, and among native speakers of the Estonian language. The same analysis also shows that voters who fulfil two out of the three criteria—education and language—are over-represented among the voters turn out at the polls. The apparently positive (but not statistically significant) effect of income on abstaining disappears when education is not included in the model, and seems to be caused by the collinearity of both variables.²¹ While age is not statistically significant in explaining abstention (compared to the polling station vote), middle-aged citizens are more likely to vote online than younger and than older citizens are. Furthermore, my study is in line with earlier findings (Trechsel, 2007a: 117), showing no clear gender gap in electoral participation in Estonia. The results remain stable when the distance to the next polling station is accounted for (model 2), as in the model that includes only socio-economic variables (model 1).

²¹ The Hausman test is satisfactory at the 95% level.

	(1) Whole survey		(2) Whole survey		(3) Only Estonian-speakers		(4) Only Russian-speakers	
	Coef.	Robust Std.Err.	Coef.	Robust Std.Err.	Coef.	Robust Std.Err.	Coef.	Robust Std.Err.
vote								
- abstainers (reference category: polling station voters)								
language	0.667 **	0.221	0.798 **	0.234				
education	-0.347 **	0.097	-0.395 **	0.105	-0.318 **	0.108	-0.537 *	0.231
	-							
age	0.0004	0.034	0.010	0.035	-0.004	0.039	0.047	0.072
	-		-					
age ²	0.0003	0.0004	0.0005	0.0004	0.0003	0.0004	-0.001	0.001
income	0.039	0.077	0.112	0.079	0.055	0.085	-0.040	0.186
gender	-0.151	0.181	-0.137	0.188	-0.056	0.197	-0.766	0.501
away								
(log)			0.837 **	0.136				
constant	0.645	0.851	-2.459	0.939	1.079	0.928	3.008	1.840
- Internet voters (reference category: polling station voters)								
language	-2.408 **	0.449	-2.305 **	0.456				
education	0.264 **	0.097	0.230 **	0.102	0.280 **	0.100	-0.411	0.642
age	0.099 **	0.032	0.108 **	0.034	0.104 **	0.034	-0.029	0.104
age ²	-0.001 **	0.0003	-0.001 **	0.0004	-0.001 **	0.0004	0.0009	0.001
income	0.355 **	0.073	0.420 **	0.079	0.362 **	0.075	0.349	0.337
gender	-0.149	0.172	-0.135	0.180	-0.088	0.177	-1.857 *	0.938
away								
(log)			0.736 **	0.121				
constant	-3.691	0.928	-6.414	1.058	-6.368	0.885	-1.286	4.132
N	973		960		854		119	
R ²	0.076		0.123		0.059		0.102	

Table 4: Multinomial logit regression for voting participation (abstainers, polling station voters, Internet voters); cases weighted to correct for over-representation of Internet-voters in the sample.

Note: To check for a possible violation of the assumption of independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA), repeated Small-Hsiao tests were conducted, indicating that the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected.


The second model includes fewer cases due to missing values for the distance variable.

The partisan composition of the Internet vote

In the final part of our empirical analysis, we consider the partisan effect. Given that the Internet vote is socially selective, the partisan-driven choices of Internet voters will likely also be quite relevant. While the previous survey did not allow a precise analysis of political preferences,²² the Internet votes were tabulated separately in the election results, and thus can give us a picture of voter's partisan leanings.

Centre-right parties appear to have benefitted most from the Internet vote. The Green party (EER), and the Pro Patria and Res Publica Union (IRL), both scored a 49% higher vote share among Internet voters than among electorate as a whole (figure 6). (26.7% of the Internet voters cast their vote for IRL—meaning this is a 49% higher vote share among Internet voters than in the 17.9% overall IRL vote share.) Furthermore, the Reform Party (REF) and the Social Democrats (SD) were popular among online voters (+24-25%); since the 2007 elections, both parties have served in a common governing coalition with the Pro Patria and Res Publica Union.

By contrast, the centre-left wing Centre Party (KE), which is popular in rural areas and among Slavic speakers, has a low share of Internet voters – two thirds lower when compared to the electorate as a whole. Two tiny parties representing the Russian minority, the Constitution Party (KONST) and the Russian Party (VEE), also did not fare well in the Internet vote. These parties were followed only by the rural People's Union (ERL) in this regard.



²² Certain parties are small, and can hardly be investigated with a limited sample; here, more than 10% of the voters refused to indicate their partisan preferences.

Figure 6: Differences in the party vote between e-voters and the whole electorate by party (relative difference).

Since the Internet vote in Estonia benefits only a part of the political spectrum, the social selectivity of the Internet has direct consequences on the political balance. If the Internet vote fosters social disparities, then they will be transformed into political disparities. In the case of the 2007 parliamentary elections, Internet voting seems to have been highly socially selective. However, we do not have any information on how the substitution effect—which has been found at the aggregated level of analysis—is related to individual voting behaviour and partisan choices.²³

Conclusion

In recent elections, Internet voting has attracted wide interest, spurring hopes that communications technologies may lead to increased voter turnout, and lead to the inclusion of voting groups that had typically abstained from elections. Estonia was the first country in the world to allow Internet voting in national parliamentary elections, and it therefore serves as an important locus for studying the state of—and prospects for—e-democracy.

Different datasets and methodologies have led us to the same conclusion: that the Internet vote in the 2007 Estonian elections was socially unbalanced, and drew a disproportionate share of voters with a high formal education, and who resided in affluent, Estonian-speaking areas. Social groups that have typically been underrepresented in the politically active part of the population (Gallego, 2007; Dalton, 2006) (particularly people of low education, low income, and/or member of the Russian-speaking minority) proved even more underrepresented among Internet voters in Estonia than they already were. Based on these facts, Internet voting seems poised to accentuate the pre-existing exclusivity of political participation, instead of diminishing it. This is a delicate matter, since the Internet vote is not politically neutral: Indeed, some parties, particularly the one belonging to the new governing coalition and the newly competing Green party, have proven particularly successful with Internet voters—while the oppositional Centre Party, which attracts a higher proportion of ethnic minorities in Estonia, along with a few smaller minority parties—won hardly any of the votes cast on the Internet.

²³ If the substitution effect signifies that *the same voters* who were previously voting at the polls were now abstaining, then it is plausible that internet voting, despite being socially selective and having a partisan connotation, has not changed the social selectivity of turnout or the electoral outcomes. This is valid if we assume that the decision of which party to vote for is made *before* deciding whether to vote online, or if both decisions are not linked to each other. If the substitution effect means that the *same* number of voters that abstained were newly attracted by the internet vote, and that, at the individual level, they do not match, then the internet vote might have had an overall social effect on turnout and a partisan effect on electoral outcomes.

These results do not suggest that the addition of Internet voting could increase voter turnout. Instead, it seems that—with a few possible exceptions—votes cast online mainly substituted for votes that would have been cast in polling stations, had the option of web voting been absent. Certainly, turnout in the 2007 Estonian elections increased by some 4% when compared to the 2003 elections. However, as I have noted, this can be explained by other factors. On the one hand, there was a genuine increase in turnout of about 1.5% across most municipalities—regardless of whether the Internet vote was used or not. Further increases of turnout can be explained through the entry of the Green party in the 2007 elections, which attracted voters in affluent, Estonian speaking areas, and in ethnically heterogeneous ones. After controlling for either political or socio-economic variables that might explain changes in turnout, it appears that Internet voting had no additional effect. Instead, the overwhelming part of Internet votes seems to have substituted turnout at the polling stations. Against the background of the social selectivity of the Internet voting, this is reassuring. While the Internet vote attracted a socially and politically specific part of the electorate to a great extent—particularly among politically well-established groups—there is little reason to believe that the same votes would not have been cast at the polls otherwise. However, should the Internet vote in other circumstances manage to attract new voters, the Estonian experience teaches us that it might increase social inequalities in political representation.

While certain hopes regarding the healing effects of the Internet vote on political participation may be debunked by these findings, this does not mean that Internet voting has had no effect. However, the effect shown in the Estonian case is different from the widely anticipated one. Indeed, Internet voting facilitated access to the polls for those citizens who live in remote areas, far away from the closest polling station. On average, 360 Internet voters stated that they saved 25 minutes by voting on the Internet instead of voting at the polls in a special post-election survey. Bearing in mind the fact that Internet voters might have over-estimated the time they may have saved, an optimistic estimation for 30,000 total Internet voters results in a figure of 12,000 hours saved in total, by the nation of Estonia. Even if such a figure is merely a product of Internet voters' imaginations, at least they will be satisfied with their own perceptions, of having saved such a valuable amount of time.

Appendix

Figure 5 with confidence intervals





Figure: Voting behaviour by linguistic group and by degree of education (1 = minimum, 4 = maximum).

Voter stream models with political parties as control variables

Seemingly unrelated regression

Equation	Obs	Parms	RMSE	R-sq	chi2	P
turnout07	234	3	0.0225622	0.7944	903.94	0
ev2007turnout	234	3	0.0085542	0.6776	491.83	0

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
turnout07						
turnout03	0.6114205	0.0287955	21.23	0	0.5549825	0.6678586
v03pt_rp	0.0156492	0.0462575	0.34	0.735	-0.0750139	0.1063124
v07pt_eer	0.7551909	0.1169558	6.46	0	0.5259618	0.98442
_cons	0.1957935	0.0141472	13.84	0	0.1680655	0.2235215
ev2007turnout						
turnout03	0.1132314	0.0109174	10.37	0	0.0918337	0.1346292
v03pt_rp	0.0856442	0.0175379	4.88	0	0.0512706	0.1200179
v07pt_eer	0.2778036	0.0443422	6.26	0	0.1908946	0.3647127
cons	-0.0545763	0.0053637	-10.18	0	-0.065089	-0.0440636

Voter stream model with economic-social control variables

Seemingly unrelated regression

Equation	Obs	Parms	RMSE	R-sq	chi2	P
turnout07	234	3	0.0211519	0.8193	1060.74	0
ev2007turnout	234	3	0.0076316	0.7434	677.92	0

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
turnout07						
turnout03	0.5545709	0.0269007	20.62	0	0.5018464	0.6072954
tax06lg	0.0476759	0.0053959	8.84	0	0.0371001	0.0582517
e_eslav	-0.0305898	0.005608	-5.45	0	-0.0415812	-0.0195984
_cons	-0.143724	0.0402786	-3.57	0	-0.2226686	-0.0647793

ev2007turnout

turnout03	0.0974689	0.0097058	10.04	0	0.0784458	0.1164919
tax06lg	0.0281142	0.0019469	14.44	0	0.0242985	0.03193
e_eslav	-0.00597	0.0020234	-2.95	0.003	-0.0099358	-0.0020043
_cons	-0.2637397	0.0145326	-18.15	0	-0.292223	-0.2352564

Seemingly unrelated regression

Equation	Obs	Parms	RMSE	R-sq	chi2	P
turnout07	234	1	0.0251476	0.7445	681.99	0
ev2007turnout	234	1	0.0105081	0.5135	247	0

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
turnout07						
turnout03	0.6954361	0.0266299	26.11	0	0.6432424	0.7476297
_cons	0.1801891	0.0153523	11.74	0	0.1500991	0.2102791
ev2007turnout						
turnout03	0.1748812	0.0111275	15.72	0	0.1530718	0.1966906
_cons	-0.0665758	0.0064151	-10.38	0	-0.0791491	-0.0540025

References

- Achen, C. H., & Shively, W. P. (1995). *Cross-level inference*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Alvarez, R. M., Hall, T. E., & Trechsel, A. H. (2008). Internet Voting in Estonia, *Voting Technology Project Working Paper*: Caltech/MIT.
- Alvarez, R. M., & Nagler, J. (2001). The likely consequences of internet voting for political representation. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, 34, 1115-1152.
- Auer, A., & Trechsel, A. H. (Eds.). (2001). *Voter par Internet? Le projet e-voting dans le canton de Genève dans une perspective socio-politique et juridique*. Genève: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.
- Breuer, F., & Trechsel, A. H. (2006). *E-Voting in the 2005 local elections in Estonia. Report for the Council of Europe: Council of Europe*, http://www.coe.int/t/e/integrated_projects/democracy/02_Activities/02_e-voting/00_E-voting_news/FinalReportEvotingEstoniaCoE6_3_06.asp#TopOfPage [Accessed on 26 May 2008.].
- Dalton, R. J. (2006). *Citizen Politics. Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Washington (DC): CQ Press.
- Gallego, A. (2007). Inequality in Political Participation: Contemporary Patterns in European Countries, *Center for the Study of Democracy, Paper 07-01*. Irvine (CA): University of California.
- Gibson, R. (2002). Elections Online: Assessing Internet Voting in Light of the Arizona Democratic Primary. *Political Science Quarterly*, 116(4), 561-583.
- Gibson, R. K. (2005). Internet voting and the European parliament elections. Problems and prospects. In A. H. Trechsel & F. Mendez (Eds.), *The European Union and e-Voting. Addressing the European Parliament's internet voting challenge* (pp. 29-59). London: Routledge.
- Gray, M., & Caul, M. (2000). Declining Voter Turnout in Advanced Industrial Democracies. The Effects of Declining Group Mobilization. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(9), 1091-1122.
- Grofman, B., Owen, G., & Collet, C. (1999). Rethinking the partisan effects of higher turnout: So what's the question? *Public Choice*, 99, 357-376.
- King, G. (1997). *A Solution to the Ecological Inference Problem*: Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- King, G., Rosen, O., & Tanner, M. A. (2004). *Ecological Inference. New Methodological Strategies*: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Liff, S., & Shepherd, A. (2004). An evolving gender digital divide, *Internet Issue Brief No. 2*. Oxford: Oxford Internet Institute.

- Luechinger, S., Rosinger, M., & Stutzer, A. (2007). The Impact of Postal Voting on Participation: Evidence for Switzerland. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 13(2), 167-202.
- Madise, Ü., Vinkel, P., & Maater, E. (2005). *Internet Voting at the Elections of Local Government Councils on October 2005: Estonian Electoral Commission*. <http://www.vvk.ee/engindex.html#0002> [Accessed on 26 May 2008.].
- Norris, P. (2001). *Digital Divide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P. (2005). e-Voting as the magic ballot for European Parliamentary elections? Evaluating e-voting in the light of experiments in UK local elections. In A. H. Trechsel & F. Mendez (Eds.), *The European Union and e-Voting. Addressing the European Parliament's internet voting challenge* (pp. 60-90). London: Routledge.
- Prevost, A. K., & Schaffner, B. F. (2008). Digital Divide or Just Another Absentee Ballot? *American Politics Research*, 36(4), 510-529.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Sikk, A., & Bochsler, D. (2008). *Impact of ethnic heterogeneity on party nationalisation in the Baltic states*. Paper presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions, 12-16 April 2008, Rennes.
- Sikk, A., & Holmgaard Andersen, R. (2009). Green without a Tinge of Red: The Fall and Rise of Estonian Greens. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 40(3).
- Solop, F. I. (2002). Digital Democracy Comes of Age: Internet Voting and the 2000 Arizona Democratic Primary Election. *Political Science and Politics*, 34(2), 289-293.
- Solvak, M., & Pettai, V. (2008). The parliamentary elections in Estonia, March 2007. *Electoral Studies*, 27(3), 574-577.
- Stolle, D., & Hooghe, M. (2005). Inaccurate, Exceptional, One-Sided or Irrelevant? The Debate about the Alleged Decline of Social Capital and Civic Engagement in Western Societies. *British Journal of Political Science*, 35(1), 149-167.
- Taagepera, R. (2006). Meteoric Trajectory: The Res Publica Party in Estonia. *Democratization*, 13(1), 78-94.
- Thomsen, S. (1987). *Danish Elections 1920–79: A Logit Approach to Ecological Analysis and Inference*. Aarhus: Politica.
- Trechsel, A. H. (2007a). Inclusiveness of old and new forms of citizens' electoral participation. *Representation*, 43(2), 111-121.
- Trechsel, A. H. (2007b). *Internet voting in the March 2007 Parliamentary Elections in Estonia. Report for the Council of Europe: Council of Europe/European University Institute*.
- Trechsel, A. H., & Mendez, F. (Eds.). (2005). *The European Union and e-Voting. Addressing the European Parliament's internet voting challenge*. London: Routledge.